

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 1, 1854.

NO. 18.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS--One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Is the Soul a Distinct Entity ?

AFFIRMATIVE BY C. F. HUDSON.

Dear Examiner,—Have just returned from absence for a few weeks. Have not time to prepare such an article as I could wish for your next number. But I should notice two or three points in review of the discussion thus far, and may add some exegesis of the passages oftenest adduced to support the negative of the question.

I find that my use of the word "immortal" in the number for July 1st, is misapprehended. I tried to make my meaning plain. I ask the reader to refer to the place. I said I "query whether the soul is not *naturally immortal*, though I am sure the smaller number of human souls may be *actually immortal*." If this expression did not explain itself, the whole paragraph would make it plain. But Bro. G., without taking my meaning at all, asks, "if it (the soul) is *naturally immortal*, is it not *naturally indestructible*?" I simply answer, it can be of no use for us thus to talk at cross-purposes. If Bro. G. objects to *my use of terms*, he might offer his criticism accordingly, and I could defend myself by citing cases of a similar use of terms. But any *argument* of my friend, which mistakes my use of terms, proves nothing, and is a burden to both of us, and our readers too. Need I still further explain my use of terms to Bro. G.? I would say, then, that in the same way that I speak, and others have spoken, of the soul as *naturally immortal*, I would also say that a stout and healthy man is *naturally* long-lived; yet he may die prematurely, by accident, or as the penalty of crime. In this discussion I simply ask to be understood, and also to be met upon opinions which I avow, and not upon the opinions, or inferences, of others.

I had said that the question between us is not whether the soul is *conscious* during the intermediate state. Bro. G. asks "if the *proper* and *actual* existence of the soul, as a distinct entity from the body, does not *necessarily* involve its consciousness?" I might advise Bro. G. that he is philosophizing here, and ask for a "thus saith the Lord," that consciousness is involved, as he supposes. But I waive this. I intend to philosophize upon

this point when I come to it, and shall ask Bro. G. to philosophize, or to reason, with me. It may appear that the *existence* of the soul, and its *consciousness*, do not keep pace with each other. Bro. G. asks, "Is that a distinct entity worthy of any man's advocacy, which has no knowledge, or thought, or affection?" I reply, were the mines of California worth anything before they were discovered? If Bro. G. is not ashamed to believe these mines were worthy to exist before they came to light, I am not ashamed of the idea of an unconscious soul. In my view, that existence is well worth while which makes my essential being the same in the life to come as in the present life, so that "*mine eyes shall behold*" my Saviour, and not another being in my stead. Such an intermediate existence, be it never so unconscious, I think I should value for what it accomplished. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." Can this death mean their temporary destruction and annihilation? Grant that the saints *exist* during the intermediate state, and this language is appropriate as expressing the care God has for them;—all the more appropriate, if their temporary, unclothed condition be one of disadvantage; but quite absurd, if it be a condition of non-existence.

There was great need that I should ask not to be misrepresented or misunderstood. In the Examiner for August 1st, Bro. G. speaks of the "felicity which, according to Br. H, immediately follows death." Where has "Br. H." said that? Did I not speak of the soul as "untented and unclothed" in the intermediate state? Did Bro. G. read my remarks on 2 Cor. 5: 4? Is it not clear from these remarks whether I hold that "we are clothed upon with immortality at death, or at the resurrection?" If not, I will try hard to speak plainer hereafter.

I shall review several of Bro. G.'s comments before I close the discussion, as they come in my way. I only ask it to be here noticed that he distinctly admits that men "temporarily perish in death." And he accordingly says, in his remarks on Matt. 10: 28, that "man can destroy the soul or life temporarily, but not *eternally*." But such an exegesis makes nonsense of the warning our Lord designed to give. Men can kill the *body temporarily*, just as well as the soul. And they certainly cannot kill the body eternally, if the resurrection be a resurrection of the *body*, rather than a resurrection of the *dead*. If we accept Bro. G.'s exegesis, Christ did not speak clearly. He should have said, "Fear not them which kill the body temporarily, but are not able to kill the soul eternally," etc.

But even this limping exegesis is inadmissible

if we turn to Luke's account of the same discourse. "Be not afraid of them that *kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do*," chapter 12 : 4. In other words, they cannot kill the soul at all. They may do what they will with the body, but the soul is in God's keeping, and men cannot reach it. It awaits the resurrection and the judgment. Let your concern be not for the body, but for the soul.

As Bro. G. takes no exception to my list of his proof texts, I will proceed with a brief examination of them. The first is :—Gen. 3 : 19. "Dust thou art." The whole argument here turns on the use of terms. Now we are agreed, I think, that man is not *mere* body. Sometimes, indeed, we speak of a corpse, as a "dead man," or a "dead person;" but not as a "man" or a "person," unless we design to use these terms in an unusual sense. The body must be *alive* or there is no "man." We are agreed in this, though we differ on the question whether the life is a soul, or a distinct entity.

But on the other hand the life must be *embodied*, or there is no "man." For thousands of years past, people have thought and talked about souls, disembodied; very absurdly, Bro. G. thinks, very properly, as I think; but the point here is, the *common use of language*; and we know that disembodied souls have not been commonly called "men," though believed to exist.

According to common speech, then, the body alone, or the soul alone, is not the man. And yet the living man is continually spoken of and addressed with reference to the most different elements, as well as the most different qualities, of his being. Bro. G. understands the difference between a large man, and a great man. We say also that such a man was "beheaded," though it would be improper to say his life or his soul was beheaded. Again we say such a man was "anxious," though no one thinks of his body as being anxious. Thus we speak of men with reference to their bodies or to their souls, just as we have occasion. We say "nobody," meaning "no man;" and we say "fifty souls," meaning "fifty men." Thus we may use the terms "body" and "soul" at times interchangeably, though at other times such confusion would be absurd.

So in Gen. 3 : 19, man is called "dust," (*haphar*) though he was also *nephesh*, and was called *nephesh*, (breath, life, soul, self, or whatever the term mean,) quite as often as he was called anything else. And this *nephesh* certainly was neither dust, nor was it taken from the dust. And Bro. G. will not say that the *nephesh* returns to dust, unless he takes it to mean "blood," when he must re-explain Gen. 2 : 7,—to say nothing of Eccl. 12 : 7. But, for the purpose in hand, the doom to be denounced against Adam, he was well addressed as "dust," because the dissolution of the body was to him the most vivid picture of death. The *nephesh* need not be named in giving his sentence, 1st, because he may not have known or thought of its nature; 2dly, because the intermediate state, the judgment, and the second death, were yet to be revealed, and were unimportant to him. So much for the terms of Adam's doom. But afterwards, when the soul come into fuller consciousness, as a power within,

energizing the body, and not a mere attribute of body, men must be told of death in fuller terms, as we have seen in Isa. 10 : 18, and Matt. 10 : 28.

Yours truly,

Cincinnati, Aug. 8, 1854. C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

I am sorry if I have, in any respect, "misapprehended" Bro. H. I trust that, by divine grace, it is our mutual desire not to "philosophize" or "reason" in any manner which is inconsistent with the revealed truth. "Let God be true." It is no marvel, if, in our continued discussion, some little misunderstanding of terms should occur. Let us forbear one another in love and patiently explain.

Bro. H. says, "I query whether the soul is not *naturally immortal*, though I am sure the smaller number of souls may be actually immortal." Now as the scriptures of divine truth so plainly teach that God will *destroy* the wicked, "soul and body," Matt. 10 : 28, I must still think it is of "use," to elicit truth, to ask, "if it, (the soul), is *naturally immortal*, is it not *naturally indestructible*?" In my view, this conclusion is unavoidable. How does our Bro. understand the declaration, God "*only* hath immortality?" Is not the import, that He only is *by nature* immortal? If so, it follows that no other being is *naturally* immortal. Moreover, I ask our friend, if he can establish the opinion, that the human soul is *naturally* immortal, by a single "thus saith the Lord," which he justly demands of us to sustain our faith? We have given him the divine testimony that man is "MORTAL;" that Immortality, (possessed *naturally* only by God himself) is the gift of God "through Jesus Christ," to be obtained by a vital holy union to Christ, and "patient continuance in well doing." If it is our natural attribute, we owe it, not to *redemption* but to *creation*. What is the holy record? It is "that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is IN HIS SON." Hallelujah! Bro. H. is "sure the smaller number of human souls may be *actually* immortal." Does not this imply that he does not believe that all human souls will exist forever? Does it not imply that many souls may be destroyed forever? If our friend is correct in supposing that natural immortality may be forfeited, he is still bound to adduce some divine testimony that man was created immortal.

I asked "if the *proper* and *actual* existence of the soul, as a distinct entity from the body, does not *necessarily* involve its consciousness?" Bro. H. thinks this is philosophizing, and asks for a "thus saith the Lord." Of course, as I believe the opinion is a dogma of vain heathen philosophy, I do not suppose that the Lord has said anything about it, except to condemn all philosophy which is "not after Christ." Col. 2 : 8. I supposed, however, that the idea of "a distinct entity" of a disembodied spirit, or soul, and still think, that such an entity, destitute of all knowledge, thought, and affection, is unworthy of our advocacy. The gold in the mine undiscovered is not analagous. The gold *undiscovered* is intrinsically the same as when

discovered. An unconscious spirit is not the same as a conscious one. I supposed I understood my friend on this subject. He wrote—"The soul survives the first death, either by the law of its nature, or by some equivalent law which we do not understand." He now writes, "I am not ashamed of the idea of an unconscious soul." Can he then conceive of the soul *surviving* without consciousness? I assure my dear brother, I had not the least idea that I was misrepresenting him, when I inferred from his own declaration, that "*the soul survives the first death*," that he believed that the "felicity (of the saints) immediately follows death." Are we now to understand him that the soul, as a distinct entity, survives without consciousness? If so, must he not admit that when man kills the body, he, in some sense, kills the soul also? Must he not admit with us that man can kill the soul in one sense, but not in another?

He remarks, "In my view that existence is well worth while which makes my essential being the same in the life to come as in the present life, so that '*mine eyes shall behold*' my Savior, and not another being in my stead. Such an intermediate existence, be it never so unconscious, I think I should value for what it accomplished." If any scriptural proof were adduced for such an unconscious intermediate state of 'a distinct entity,' we would not presume to affirm that it is destitute of 'value.' As no such proof is offered, I ask, what can such a theory accomplish more than a resurrection of the entire man from the dead? The period of unconsciousness is the same in both cases. In the latter, the life of the believer is hid with Christ in God, to be restored at the appearing of Jesus. "When Christ who is our life shall appear then shall we also appear with him in glory." Then, and not before, shall we see him and be like him forever. The glorious power of God, in the resurrection, will secure our "essential being" so far as conscious identity is concerned.

"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." It is asked, "Can this death mean their temporary destruction and annihilation?" Let the scriptures of truth answer. "And the Lord said, I will DESTROY man whom I have created from the face of the earth." Gen. 6:7; 9:15. The words destroy and destruction are used also in reference to the first death in the following passages. Gen. 18:23; Eccles. 7:16, 17; John 2:19; 1 Cor. 6:13; Ps. 90:3; 91:6. Several of these passages refer to the death of the righteous. All are pertinent. If the first death of the *wicked* is a temporary destruction, the death of the *righteous* is the same. They have no pre-eminence in this matter, abstractly considered, either over wicked men or beasts. Eccles. 3:19. That this death is not limited to a part of man—that there is no soul, or distinct entity which, as our brother affirms, "survives the first death," is most clearly proved by the plain declaration of the Eternal Spirit, that in that very day (of death) the "thoughts perish;" "also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished." The Savior's soul was in *sheol* (though not left there) where there is no work, or knowledge, or device. Eccles. 9:10; Ps. 16:10; and Acts 2:31.

"Grant that the saints *exist* during the intermediate state," our brother remarks, "and this language is appropriate as expressing the care God has for them—but quite absurd, if it be a condition of non-existence." I ask if the death of the saint may not be precious in the sight of the Lord, whatever view we may take of the intermediate state? I affirm that the promise of a resurrection to life eternal proves it to be so, notwithstanding the fulfillment of the decree, (plainly applicable to the entire man) "DUST THOU art and unto DUST shalt thou return." Has our brother never sung that God

"Looks down and watches all my dust
Till he shall bid it rise?"

Did he sing an absurdity? I trow not.

In reference to Matt. 10:28, I ask brother H., how we can reconcile the two scriptural declarations that man does kill the soul, and that man cannot kill the soul, except by supposing that he can kill it in one sense but not in another? I did not affirm that killing it temporarily, but not eternally, was the precise meaning of the Savior. Brother H. may reject my comment if he pleases. I will thank him for a better one. He must however give me one reconcilable with the plain and repeated declarations of the Bible, which we have adduced, that the entire man is subject to death.

On Gen. 3:19, our friend remarks, "The body must be *alive*, or there is no man." "We are agreed in this." Nay, my brother. If we were, we should both disagree with the spirit of truth, which pronounced the perfect material organism "formed—of the dust of the ground," to be "MAN" previous to the impartation of life. The testimony is not, that the organized dust *became man* by the impartation of life. It is, that by the simple impartation of "the breath of life," "man became a living soul." The organism was *man before*. God *breathing into the nostrils* made the man a *living soul*, or person—a *living man*. I seriously ask our brother to review this divine testimony of the creation of MAN, independently of all human theories. "The Lord God formed MAN of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and MAN became a living soul." I submit the question to the intelligent mind of our brother—Is not the plain teaching here, that the perfect material organism, formed of the dust of the ground, with the breath of life in the nostrils, imparting animation to the whole frame, constituted the living man? Will he deny our affirmation, that there is not a single word here to warrant the notion of any entity distinct from the breathing living organism formed of the dust? Is it possible that the Spirit of Truth, giving account of the creation and constitution of man, should wholly omit that which constitutes the far more important part of Him? Alas! for the anomaly. That which the oracles of God denominates MAN, the wisdom of man denominates the mere *tenement* of man. Must not such wisdom be foolishness with God? Two marvellous errors demand consideration. The wonderful perfect organism formed of the dust by the omnipotent hand, and declared to be MAN, is reduced to a mere *tenement* of man; and the breath of the nostrils, which simply gave ani-

mation to the man, is exalted to a distinct entity of superior nature, capable of survivance when its tenement is dissolved! Thus has a heathen philosophy of an immortal soul nullified the revealed truth of God.

Our friend thinks "that disembodied souls have not been commonly *called*" men, "though believed to exist." The common sentiment appears to be that the disembodied soul is the *essential man*, who, at death, if a saint, goes to his reward. The Savior's parable is adduced to prove that the "rich man" is now in conscious misery. He remarks, "the body alone, or the soul alone, is not the man." Although the original term translated *soul* is, in the scriptures, occasionally applied to the mental powers, its proper import is *life*, and is often so translated, though not so often as it should be. I have proved from Gen. 2: 7, that the material organism itself is *man*, who, by the breath of life in his nostrils, became a living soul or person.

Our brother correctly affirms in reference to the term "*nephesh*" that it "was neither dust nor was it taken from the dust." This however is no proof that it imports "a distinct entity," or an immortal essence of any kind. The learned believers in the natural immortality of the soul admit that the proper import of the term is "*breath*." We derive much confidence of the correctness of our views from the fact, that the word of the Lord, (the only reliable source of information on the subject,) contains, in the original, not a single sentence or word, warranting the opinion of man's possessing any "distinct entity" from the material organism, animated simply by the breath of life. Truly "Bro. G. will not say that the *nephesh* returns to dust." The breath of life, at death, "returns to God who gave it." It is no more a "distinct entity," or surviving conscious substance, *subsequently* to its leaving the body, or the man, than it was such an entity or substance anterior to its being given to the man. Eccles. 3: 23, the same original word, *ruach*, is used to denote "the spirit of the beast" as is used to denote "the spirit of man." It is no more "a distinct entity" in the one case than in the other.

Our brother thinks that the subject of death was not fully revealed to Adam. I reply, that which was revealed to him on the subject is totally subversive of the opinion of our opponents. God threatened Adam in a manner to be understood. In no other sense could he understand the threatening, "Thou shalt surely die," than that *the entire man* should cease to live. "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." But this is not true if the nobler part, "the soul (as our brother affirms) survives the first death." The threatening in this case, was not fulfilled in the first death. Isa. 10: 18, and Matt. 10: 28, are referred to as revealing the subject of death "in fuller terms." The former is opposed to our friend's opinion, for it clearly represents the entire consuming of "both soul and body" at one and the same time. The other equally fails our brother's purpose, for *psuche* so far from importing "a distinct entity," means "the breath, vital breath, the vital principle." *Robinson's Lexicon*. This is the *primary* meaning. It suggests another and more unobjec-

tionable import of the words of our blessed Lord, which I submit for consideration. Man can kill the body, or the man, but cannot kill the *life*. He cannot destroy the principle of life. The vital breath returns to God who gave it. When God made man of the dust of the ground he imparted "the breath of lives" (Heb.) that mysterious principle which he imparts to entities or substances as he pleases. This distinguished the animate from the inanimate. "Ye are dead," *i. e.*, liable to death; ye men, not a mere part of you, and "your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 3, 4. How is the life of dead believers hid with Christ in God? If it is by the survivance of distinct entities, constituting the chief part of men, then certainly the *men* have never died. Our life, *i. e.*, its restoration, is secured "with Christ in God," and will be granted at his appearing who is "the resurrection and the life." Thus the word of truth connects our life with our resurrection.

May the Lord grant us understanding in all things.

Yours for the Truth,

HENRY GREW.

THE DISCUSSION.

"DOES THE BIBLE TEACH THAT THE CREATURE MAN—WHICH THE LORD GOD FORMED OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND—HAS A SUPERADDED ENTITY CALLED THE SOUL?"

The Affirmative by Prof. Mattison.

Mr. Editor.—It must be obvious to our readers that while you have no difficulty in noticing all that I may advance in the direct argument, it is impossible for me to notice all you say in review; much less in your rejoinders to my replies. Were I to do so, we might remain for months discussing points already raised, without advancing a step farther with the main question. This, I am sure, would not please our readers; and you have more than intimated in your last that I am devoting too much space to my Reviewer, and too little, comparatively, to the direct argument.

Accepting, then, your suggestion, I shall pass most of your last response unnoticed for the present, and devote most of the present article to the direct proof of the question in hand.

But I ought not to proceed without *some* notice of my Reviewer, even though I may not answer all your criticisms. For the sake of system, then, and to economize space, I will confine my present rejoinder to the *first part* of your last response; leaving your remarks upon my *new arguments* for future consideration.

1. You seem disposed to take back the virtual concession that there are minds in the universe without bodies. You mean simply without *animal* bodies. Do you then deny that "God is a spirit" without any body whatever?

But you seem to think the "spiritual body" of St. Paul is not an "*animal*" body. If by "*animal*" you mean *mortal and corruptible*, I agree

with you. The Apostle's "spiritual body," is a corruptible, material body, made incorruptible and immortal; but it is an organized body still. Such was the "glorious body" of Christ—"flesh and bones" still, though immortal! It is "THIS CORRUPTIBLE" which shall put on incorruption; and "THIS MORTAL" which shall put on immortality. And being invested with these two attributes of spirit—incorruptibility and immortality—it is no longer a "natural body," but a "spiritual" one. Like a spirit it can "die no more," and it is therefore called a "spiritual body." But it is nevertheless a *body*, and such a one as neither God nor angels have. It is of no avail, therefore, to cite St. Paul in proof that all spirits have "spiritual bodies;" and the point remains indubitably settled, (however fatal it may be to your materialism,) that spirits *can* and *do* exist without material bodies.

2. You insist that I have argued the existence of a soul in man, from the simple fact that he manifests *intelligence*. That may be a legitimate ground for such an argument; and I may use it hereafter; but I am not aware of having done so as yet; and as my arguments are all in print, would it not have been better to have *quoted* my argument than to meet my denial by a simple contradiction? If I have thus argued it will be easy to produce the argument: Will you please do so in your next response?

3. You object to my use of the term *spirit* in the sense of *soul*; but this objection is not well founded. Webster's first definition of the term "*soul* is, The spiritual, rational and immortal substance in man, which distinguishes him from brutes," &c.; and he also gives as one meaning of the term "*spirit*," "The soul of man; the intelligent, immaterial and immortal part of a human being;" and adds ["See Soul."] I have then, the authority of this greatest of English Lexicographers, for using the terms *soul* and *spirit* interchangeably as synonymous. That they are used synonymously in the Scriptures is certain. What was the "soul" of Rachel which departed, Gen. 35: 18, if it was not her *spirit*? And what is the "spirit" that returns to God who gave it, if it is not the *soul* that departs at death? Though each of those terms is used in other senses, (and how few terms have not more than one meaning?) still it is certain that they are also used in the same sense, to indicate "the spiritual, rational and immortal substance in man." It is vain therefore to attempt to destroy the force of my proof-texts, by asserting that the term "spirit" used in part of them does not mean the human soul! Such an attempt is a virtual concession that the Bible is against you; and that my arguments are unanswerable.

4. You devote a whole page to my twelve lines on 1 Cor. 15: 46, 47, and conclude that one of us must be "sadly confused on the 46th verse." I perceive this is the case, and must try and help you out of your confusion.

The general subject under consideration by Paul is the resurrection of the dead. The particular point in view is that introduced at the 35th verse, by the question, "How are the dead raised up?

and with what body do they come?" His answer is, *Firstly*, that the *death* of the body is no obstacle to its future life, verses 36-38: *Secondly*, that there are various kinds of flesh on earth, and that there are *celestial* as well as *terrestrial* bodies, 39, 40: and *Thirdly*, that following these analogies, the resurrection body will be "the same body" though raised in incorruption and glory,—a "spiritual body," verses 42 and 43. Then comes the affirmation, verse 44—"There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from Heaven." Now my "exegesis" of these verses is this: To show that the dead, though corruptible and mortal, may be raised to glory and immortality, the Apostle refers to the different kinds of flesh—to bodies, celestial and terrestrial, natural and spiritual—and then, for illustration, and to show that the present corruptible state of man is no proof that he will not be incorruptible hereafter; cites the fact that man, at first, had only the natural body, without the soul, and afterward the *spirit*—which gave it life. It is a simple reference to the creation of Adam, Gen. 2: 7, first the body and then the spirit; and we should like to know where else any thing like it "is written." Surely nowhere in all the Bible. We are shut up to this view of the subject, or to the inextricable confusion of the Examiner.

But with this understanding all is clear. The "natural" "was" first, (not *is to be*) and then the "spiritual." The first man—the *body*—is of the earth, earthy, the second man is "the Lord from Heaven," breathing the "breath of lives" into the lifeless body. The reference being to the history of the *origin* of Adam, the simple and obvious meaning is that his *body* is from the earth, and his *spirit* from God. So "it is written" Gen. 2: 7, and *no where else*. From this beautiful analogy the Apostle proceeds: First, the *body*, then the *spirit*; first the *natural* body then the *spiritual* body—first the *earthy*, then the *heavenly*. "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." "THE DEAD shall be raised incorruptible," and the living shall "all be changed." Not *through faith* as you gratuitously assert, but *without faith*; for "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth," John v. 28; and "there shall be a resurrection of the dead BOTH OF THE JUST AND THE UNJUST," Acts 24: 15.

5. You wish to know if I deny that animals live by breathing. I answer, Some do and some do not. Fish, oysters, lobsters, and all marine shell fish are as much *animals* as a horse or an elephant; but does the Examiner pretend that these all *breathe*? How does an oyster breathe, and where are his "nostrils?" Your error consists in supposing that there are no animals but *land* animals,—birds, quadrupeds, &c.—forgetting the fact that the earth and waters are full of animals that have *life*, but have no "NOSTRILS," and do not

"BREATHE." Many such, like the whole tribe of shell-fish, live without breathing, and have no red blood. It is certain, therefore, that there may be life without nostrils or breathing; and your favorite hypothesis that *breath* in the nostrils is the only cause of life, falls to the ground.

6. You have finally admitted, virtually, that upon your theory all that was necessary to cause the lifeless body of Adam to live was to fill his lungs with air, and set him to breathing. This you do by citing a case in which a "lifeless" body was brought to life by the application of heat, and stimulants, and air breathed into the lungs. But was there no more life here than in Adam before God breathed into his nostrils? Was ever a person thus brought to life who was really DEAD? You think there have been; and that if there had only been some one to have used the bellows, or blown the breath into Adam's nostrils, instead of his Maker, he would just as surely have become a living soul! This is the obvious import of your remarks; and it is all that is demanded by my "bellows argument," which you have tried in vain to laugh out of countenance.

7. You kindly inform our readers once more that my arguments are irrelevant, or rather, now, that I have altogether "abandoned the ground I was pledged to defend." Still you condescend to follow me out of courtesy. Well, if I waste my time arguing other questions, that is my loss. But I have no difficulty in seeing the connexion between my arguments and the proposition; and I think our readers will not. Why not let *them* judge, and not attempt to act as disputant and umpire both?

8. I must remind you that we are not discussing the question of the HAPPINESS or MISERY of souls after they leave the body. It is enough, for my present purpose, that I prove that they *separate* from the body at death. Excuse me, therefore, if I decline following you at present, in your disquisitions upon future punishment.

I trust, however, that our readers will not be so blinded by this "dust" as not to see the utter weakness of your reply to my proofs and arguments.

Leaving for the present the balance of your ten pages of response (solely for want of space in your columns to answer all you have said,) I shall now proceed with my argument.

To show that man has a *soul* distinct from his body, and originally "superadded thereto," I have already established the following points:

I. That the Scriptures everywhere recognize the philosophical distinction between the BODY and the SPIRIT; and the two-fold nature of man.

II. That they uniformly represent death as a SEPARATION of the body and spirit of man.

You have been pleased to pronounce both of these propositions irrelevant to the question, and will probably honor my next with a similar judgment; and yet I doubt if we have a solitary reader who will not admit that if either of these propositions is proved, the doctrine that man has a soul superadded to his material nature is established. And yet you pronounce the arguing of these propositions the "abandoning the question at issue

entirely!" You can see no connection, between the *separation* of the soul from the body at death, and the question whether man has a soul or not! I may prove from the Bible that the body and spirit are DISTINCT—that the soul LEAVES the body at death—and that it is CONSCIOUS from death to the general resurrection;—but all this does not even prove that man has a soul distinct from his body!!

Leaving our readers to judge between us, I shall now proceed to show,

III. That man has not only a SOUL distinct from his body, which SEPARATES from it at death; but that the period between death and the general resurrection is one of CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE to all human spirits.

1. The first proof that I shall offer in support of this proposition is the words of Christ to the dying thief, Luke 23: 42, 43. "And he [the thief] said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

It is obvious, first, that the thief expected to die. Hence he speaks of their being "in like condition" with Christ, "receiving the due reward of their deeds." And you certainly will not deny that the prevailing belief among the Jews was, that the soul left the body at death, and went to Hades, or the world of spirits, to return again at the general resurrection. Hence Josephus, in his discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades, says, "This is the discourse concerning Hades, wherein the souls of all men are confined until a proper season which God hath determined, when he will make a resurrection of all men from the dead. * * * And to every body shall its own soul be restored."

This was the popular belief among the Jews at the time of the crucifixion, and was evidently the belief of the thief when he made his request, "Lord, remember me, &c."

The term "Paradise" signifies *pleasure* or *delight*; and is used in the New Testament to signify *Heaven*. Paul was caught up to Paradise, 2 Cor. 12: 4; and when the spirit would incite believers to holiness by the promise of eternal life, he says, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God;" Rev. 2: 7. Now the promise of the Saviour was that the thief should be with him *THAT DAY* in paradise? Is not paradise the heaven to which Paul was caught up, where grows the tree of life? If not, what is it? In what other paradise did Christ and the thief meet that day? Here, then, we have the explicit declaration of Christ that according to the prevailing belief of the separate existence of souls, implied in his request, the thief should meet him *THAT DAY* in heaven. If he meant simply that he would be DEAD that day—in the paradise of unconsciousness—what kind of a "remembrance" was that? and what better off was he who prayed, than he who railed? The passage can have but one meaning; and that is that the spirit of the thief should meet the spirit of Christ, which he was about to commend to his Father's hands, in the kingdom of heaven.

2. Luke 20 : 27, 38. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead but of the living : for ALL LIVE UNTO HIM."

The Lord appeared to Moses in the bush 1491 years before Christ. Abraham died B. C. 1821, Isaac, B. C. 1716, and Jacob, B. C. 1689 ; consequently at that time, (1491, B. C.) Abraham had been dead 330 years, Isaac 225 years, and Jacob 198 years. And yet God declares himself to be the God of those persons. Now the argument of our Lord, based upon this passage is this : God is not the God of the dead, but of the living only ; God is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ; therefore Abraham, Isaac and Jacob must still live. *

And this he distinctly declares ; "all live unto God." The bearing of this quotation upon the resurrection of the dead is this : The Sadducees denied the immortality of the soul, as well as the resurrection of the body. And with them the two doctrines stood or fell together. To show, therefore, that the soul lived after death, and thus to overthrow the *system* of the Sadducees, was to silence their objections to the resurrection. Besides, if the soul of Abraham survived the death of his body, it affords ground for a strong presumption that sooner or later the body will live also.

3. Matt. 10 : 28. "And fear not them which kill the body, but ARE NOT ABLE TO KILL THE SOUL." Here we have, (1,) the distinction between the soul and body. The soul is not the body, neither is the body the soul. (2,) While men are able to kill the body, they "are not able to kill the soul." The soul is not killed, then, when the body is killed. And yet you insist that the soul dies in all cases with the body ; so that whenever the body of a disciple was killed by the persecutor, his soul was killed also. To this I oppose the express declaration of Christ, that men "ARE NOT ABLE TO KILL THE SOUL." It LIVES after the body dies, for "ALL LIVE UNTO GOD."

4. The conscious existence of the spirit after death is clearly taught in the account of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke 16 : 19-31. And it makes no difference whether it be regarded as a history or a parable. In both cases the souls of the parties are represented as living, talking, remembering, &c., after death. The rich man dies, and is buried, and then lifts up his eyes in hell, living in torments. Lazarus "dies," and is carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom. What does this misery after death—this reference to the "life-time" of Dives as then past—indeed this whole narrative teach, if it be not this ;—that souls live after the body dies, and are happy or miserable in a future state ?

Let any reader turn to this narrative, and read it carefully over, verse after verse, (for I have not room to quote it) and if he does not find there the doctrine of the conscious existence of souls after death, he can find it in no creed or essay or argument. Language could not teach it more plainly ;

and the spirit that can pervert this, would pervert any language that could be used.

5. Matt. 17 : 3. "And there appeared unto him Moses and Elias talking unto him." Elias or Elijah was translated to heaven 928 years before, without seeing death. See 2 Kings, 2d chapter. MOSES DIED 1483 years before. "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab—and he, [Jehovah] buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor : but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." Deut. 34. 5.

This passage settles the fact that MOSES DIED and WAS BURIED.

But neither the body of Moses, nor that of any other person, had at that time risen from the dead, "to die no more." Christ was to be "the first that should rise from the dead," Acts 26 : 23 ; and St. Paul declares that he was the "first fruits of them that slept." 1 Cor. 15 : 20. He styles him "the first born from the dead ; that in all things he might have the preeminence," Col. 1 : 18 ; and the Revelator also calls him "the first begotten of the dead," Rev. 1 : 5.

Nothing, therefore, can be clearer than this ; that as the transfiguration was before the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, the body of Moses had not been raised from the dead. What was it, then, that appeared on Mount Tabor, and talked with Christ ? that which Matthew calls "Moses ?" His *body* certainly was not there, for he had not risen from the dead ; and as you say human souls have no life or consciousness till their bodies are raised ; will you please tell us what this "Moses" was ?

I offer this as an incontrovertible instance, in which a human spirit has manifested itself as having a conscious existence while the body it once occupied lay in the grave. The *spirit* of Moses met Elijah and Christ on the top of Tabor near fifteen centuries after his body died, and while it yet slumbered in the valley of Moab, where it doubtless sleeps still ; and yet you affirm that spirits have no conscious existence out of the body ! Please be particular and give this case your special attention in the next response.

6. The book of Revelation represents the righteous dead as indescribably happy, singing and praising God in a world of light. In the 7th chapter a great multitude which no man could number is seen before the throne, clothed in white and with palms in their hands. They came out of great tribulation, but are now before the throne, where all tears are wiped away.

"No oppressive heat they feel,
From the sun's director ray ;
In a milder clime they dwell,
Region of eternal day."

In the 5th chapter we have another view of the happy residents of heaven and also in the 19th chapter it is written, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord FROM HENCEFORTH." They have not to sleep a thousand, or four thousand years, before they can be with Christ, as Materialism teaches, but will enter *at once* upon their reward.

"We know when the silver chord is loosed,
When the veil is rent away,
Not long and dark shall the passage be,
To the realms of endless day."

Now all these apocalyptic views of the heavenly world are essentially wrong, unless it be true that the spirits of the righteous dead are now happy with Christ in heaven, while their bodies slumber in the grave till the resurrection morn. Let it not be forgotten that they are beyond the region of tears and sorrow: and therefore the description can relate to no assembly of mortals on this side of death. They are our happy brethren who, like Moses, have crossed the flood and entered Canaan, though their bodies still sleep in the vale of death.

7. In harmony with this last representation, the spirits of the dead are to return to earth with Christ when he shall come to raise their bodies and judge the world. Paul speaks of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ WITH ALL HIS SAINTS; 1 Thess. 3: 13; and Jude, quoting the prophecy of Enoch says, "Behold the Lord cometh WITH TEN THOUSAND OF HIS SAINTS," &c., v. 14.

Now, we ask, *Who* and *what* are these "saints" that are to come with Christ at his second appearing? Are they the *bodies* of Christians that he is coming to raise? or are they the *spirits* of the sainted dead, who have been with him for ages in heaven, and now accompany him back as he descends to blow the last dread trumpet, and to raise their bodies to glory and immortality? Is not this last the obvious and incontrovertible doctrine of Divine Revelation?

I have thus shown from the Scriptures that the creature Man, has a distinct superadded entity called the soul,

First. By the history of the creation of Adam, in which the body is first made, and then the spirit breathed into it:

Secondly, By a large class of Scriptures recognizing the distinction between the body and the spirit, and the two-fold nature of man:

Thirdly, By numerous Scriptures which represent death as a SEPARATION of the soul from the body, and

Finally, By numerous passages that teach that the soul is CONSCIOUS in HAPPINESS OR MISERY, from death to the general resurrection.

Life begins with the union of soul and body—death is a separation of these two natures—the souls of the righteous ascend to "paradise," or "Abraham's bosom," at death, to be with Christ till he return to raise their bodies, now made incorruptible and glorious, and in them ascend to heaven to dwell in God's presence forever! Such is the plain, simple, obvious, but glorious teaching of divine revelation.

I have not introduced arguments drawn from philosophy or metaphysics, because the question was, *What do the Scriptures teach?* and I have by no means exhausted the Scripture argument. Yet I shall devote no further space to the direct proofs of the single question, whether or not man has a soul. If the arguments adduced, do not prove it, nothing could. In my next, therefore, I shall pay my respects more directly to my Reviewer of the Examiner.

H. MATTISON.

NEW YORK, Sept. 2d.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 1, 1854.

Response to Prof. Mattison by the Editor.

We shall, as heretofore, follow the Prof. by his numbered paragraphs, or topics; noticing first his remarks on our last response.

"1." We made no "virtual concession" such as the Prof. speaks of; and hence are not "disposed to take back" anything. We are glad that the Prof. sees that the spiritual body, of which Paul speaks, 1 Cor. 15, is an organized body, and not an immaterial one. His assumption that it is such an one as angels do not have, rests on his mere *ipse dixit*, and the Prof.'s "indubitably settled" point, "that spirits can and do exist without material bodies," rests alone on his assumption, and is unsupported by a solitary testimony of Scripture: and hence is not "fatal" to our materialism, nor in the least degree convincing.

"2." We did not say that the Prof. argued the existence of a soul in man from the "simple fact that he manifests intelligence;" but he did make that fact *one* of his arguments; and we affirmed, and now re-affirm, that such an argument equally proves a soul in all animals which manifest intelligence. We do not know what the Prof. means, by asking if we had not better have quoted his argument on the point. It was before the reader in his own article and in his own words. Surely that was enough.

"3." The Prof. here felt himself in a "strait betwixt two"—*viz*: The authority of the Scriptures and that of Mr. Webster; but finally chose to rely on the latter; and thus makes out to his own satisfaction that he is justified in using the terms soul and spirit synonymously, or as words of the same import. We would inform him, however, that Mr. Webster is just as good authority, in this case, as the Prof. himself, and no better. The Prof. and his theological school have assumed that these terms are synonymous, and that soul and spirit mean the same thing, *viz*., an immortal entity in man; and Mr. Webster, as a faithful Lexicographer, tells the world one sense attached to these words, by *theological* usage, is, an "immaterial and immortal part in man," &c. Does that prove the *theological* definition is true? By no means. What saith "the law and testimony"? if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." We have, in our previous articles, shown that the scripture usage is against the *theological* use of the terms soul and spirit; and that they are not synonymous in scripture, nor used interchangeably. Till

the Prof. can show they are, he only deals in assumptions, and Mr. Webster cannot help him. We think if the Prof. could have obtained help from the Bible he would no more have gone to Webster than to the witch of Endor. We told him in our last what Rachel's was, and shall not repeat it. See Examiner, page 266. One thing is perfectly certain, it was not a *theological* spirit; and all the Prof.'s "proof texts"—as he calls them—based on the term spirit, have no stronger foundation than Mr. Webster's *echo* of theological assumptions. But Mr. Webster gives 21 definitions of the term spirit, and his first is—"Primarily, wind; air in motion: hence, *breath*." On the term soul he has 15 definitions; and gives no scripture authority for the one for which the Prof. contends.

"4." The Prof.'s kind attempt to help us out of the confusion arising from his language on 1 Cor. 15: 46, in his last, is appreciated by us; yet we have to confess, we get no light from the effort. The very first thing the Prof. introduces from Paul's words is fatal to his interpretation. It is—"How are *the dead* raised up? and with what *bodies* do they [*the dead*] come?" It is not—How do souls come down from heaven, and what bodies do they get? So it should read to correspond with the Prof.'s theory. But it is *the dead* that are to be raised, and come with some *bodies*. "With what bodies do *they* come?" Is it that body they had at death? No, saith Paul—"That which thou sowest is not that body which shall be," &c., "but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body." *The dead* are the subjects of the resurrection, and these dead are to come with bodies; thus showing that the apostle is not speaking of the body merely, nor mainly; but of *the man*, whom he affirms to be dead; and whose case he had declared to be hopeless for a future life if there is no resurrection.

The construction which the Prof. puts on the 44th verse, and onward, is totally inadmissible on his own theory. He saith, the first man Adam is the *BODY*; or that he "had only the natural body without the soul, and, afterward the spirit which gave it life." The text he quotes to prove this is, "The first man Adam was made a *LIVING SOUL*." Let it be well observed, that our Prof. affirms the first man Adam, "had *ONLY* the natural body *WITHOUT THE SOUL*;" and that it was the spirit, i. e., the soul, according to his theology, or the second man that gave life to the first man. But Paul, in opposition to the Prof. affirms "the

first man Adam was made a living soul;" and that it was *afterward* that the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. "Howbeit that was not first which was spiritual, but that which is natural"—*psuchikon*—*animal*. It was the animal man that was the living soul, and not a superadded second Adam called soul. The living soul was such, Paul affirms, *before* the spiritual body was brought into existence; indeed, so far as man is concerned, he teaches the spiritual is yet future, and only to be realized at the last trump; and that all men, so far as descended only from Adam the first, are of the earth earthy.

That the Apostle speaks of two Adams in this chapter, in our mind, does not admit of a doubt. That those two were Adam the first, or earthy Adam, and the last Adam, which was heavenly, and was Christ, is unquestionable. He introduced Christ at the opening of the chapter: Christ died—Christ was buried—Christ rose from the dead—Christ became the first-fruits of them that slept—by *MAN* came death, by *MAN* came also the resurrection from the dead: *IN ADAM* men die, *IN CHRIST* men are made alive. Christ the first-fruits, *afterward* they that are Christ's at his coming. There is a natural—*psuchikon*—*animal* body, or *person*—for the term body is often used in Scripture for the person himself—and there is a spiritual body or person. Here is a clear carrying out his argument in the first part of the chapter, by showing what the animal Adam did, namely, brought death to his race; and what may be expected from Christ, whom he now speaks of as the last Adam, who is to give life from the dead to all *in Christ*. "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul" or creature: "the last Adam a quickening spirit." From this statement the Prof. says, "First the body, then the spirit;" and adds, "We should like to know where else"—than in Gen. 2: 7—"anything like it is written"? and affirms, "no where in all the Bible."

Now, what does Paul say is written? First—"The first man Adam was made a *LIVING SOUL*"—not a mere body without life, as the Prof.'s theory maintains, dependent upon another Adam, afterward, to be superadded to give him life. We now ask, Does the apostle say, "it is *WRITTEN*, the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit?" His language does not necessarily imply such a construction, but we are quite willing the Prof. should have it so; and he saith it is no where else written in all the Bible, that the last Adam was made a quickening spirit, except in Gen. 2: 7.

Sure, we are, it is not written there, wherever else it may or may not be found. But when Adam the first had brought death upon himself and posterity "it is written," that THE SEED of the woman "shall bruise" the "head" of the tempter; which shows who the "QUICKENING spirit" was to be—not Adam the first, nor an immaterial spirit in him, but a seed to be born of woman; a second Adam, of whom Paul saith, Rom. 5. 14, the Adam before Moses, was a FIGURE. This promised seed was AFTERWARD more fully exhibited to Abraham as his seed, which Paul saith, Gal. 3: 16, "WAS CHRIST." That seed was "written" of by nearly all the prophets of the Old Testament, and "written" of as a "quickenning spirit," to give life to those who inherit death by their descent from Adam the first. So fully was he WRITTEN of that Jesus tells the Jews their Scriptures reveal eternal life, testifying of him as the person to whom they should come if they would have life. See John 5: 39, 40. And in the same chapter IT IS WRITTEN: "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them; even so the SON QUICKENETH whom he will." Thus notwithstanding the Prof.'s hasty affirmation, we find it written throughout the Bible, in various forms, and in the text last quoted, in express terms, that Christ quickeneth; and is hence the spiritual Adam—the promised seed to quicken and give life to men, such as they had not by the first Adam; and so Paul saith, Rom. 8: 8-11, "If any man have not the SPIRIT of Christ, he is none of his, * * * and if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you"—thus being made partakers of the spiritual nature of Christ—"he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also QUICKEN your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you:" not by an immaterial soul, superadded to your bodies at your creation! Christ—the last Adam—by God's appointment has become the head of the spiritual creation; he has the quickening power, to quicken men from the dead, and cause them to live again.

We have now shown that the Prof.'s statement—that "the last Adam was made a quickening spirit," was no where WRITTEN in all the Bible, except Gen. 2: 7,—is a pure assumption. His concluding remarks on this topic, gives the Universalists the entire ground, and contradicts the Apostle's testimony; for the Apostle clearly distinguishes between those "in Christ" and those not. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of ALL MEN most miserable;" verse 19. Here is a clear distinction between believers and unbelievers; and Paul in winding up his argument, saith, "WE," [who? men "without faith," as the Prof. affirms? No: "we," in distinction of all other men with whom he had contrasted those in Christ.] "We shall not all sleep, but we" [who are in Christ] "shall all be changed," &c. Whatever the Scriptures may say of the resurrection of the wicked elsewhere, the apostle is not talking of them here. He is showing how those who sleep in Jesus, or being in Christ and are alive at the last trump, are to be made incorruptible and immortal, through and by Christ; and adds, "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Those who are the sub-

jects of the resurrection and change, Paul speaks of here, triumph and praise God for their deliverance from death and corruption; and Paul tells us who shall have this glorious privilege—"To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, SEEK FOR glory, and honor, and IMMORTALITY, eternal life;" Rom. 2: 7. Such a course requires faith; and we rather think no man will get incorruptibility or immortality without faith, the Prof. to the contrary notwithstanding.

"5." If the Prof. finds animals that do not breathe, our remarks had no reference to them. We spoke of that class that do breathe, and gave Scripture testimony on the subject, which the Prof. did not choose to controvert. Let him try his skill at disproving that the animals we named live without breath, or without nostrils. Till he can do that his talk about oysters and shell-fish avails nothing. We spoke of such creatures as live by breathing. Will our friend tell us if such creatures as were made to live by breathing can live without breath in their nostrils? When their breath goeth forth do they not die? We will give him one more text on this subject which may cover the whole ground so far as our discussion is concerned. Psa. 104: 25 to 30. "This great and wide SEA, wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts * * * there is that leviathan, whom thou hast made to play therein; these all wait upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season * * * thou openest thy hand, they are filled with good; * * * thou takest away their BREATH, they die and return to their dust." Now, so far as relates to other animals, besides "land animals," even the "innumerable CREEPING THINGS in the sea," inspiration testifies they live by "breath," and that when God "takest away their breath, they die:" but the Prof.'s "philosophy" affirms revelation is in "error:" for saith he, "The earth and waters are full of animals that have life but do not breathe!" That is, they have NO BREATH for God to take away!

"6." The Prof., under this head, "virtually" denies that the child was dead that Elisha restored to life. The record saith, the child "died:" 2 Kings, 4: 20.

"7." We are perfectly willing to let "our readers judge" in this matter, and have no fears what their judgment will be.

"8." The Prof. has not proved yet that such a soul exists in man, as he contends for: not one solitary text has he produced up to this point of the discussion to favor his affirmative. No evidence has he given that soul and spirit are synonymous terms in Scripture usage, and yet he insists that if he can prove spirit and body are separated at death there must have been superadded to the creature man an entity called the soul, at his creation. BREATH is separated from the body at death. "HIS BREATH GOETH, he returneth to his dust," &c. "There was no BREATH left in him" at death. See Psa. 146: 4, and 1 Kings 17: 17. Now the Prof. might just as well attempt to prove from such expressions that the breath is a distinct entity—a conscious being—as to attempt to prove a distinct entity in man called the soul, from the fact that that which is called spirit in man is se-

parated from the body at death. The truth is, the Scriptures never speak of either the soul or spirit as a distinct entity from man, any more than they do of his breath, his heart, or any other attribute of man.

The Prof. suggested at the outset that he should pass most of our last response unnoticed at present, assigning as one reason that we had intimated that he was devoting too much time to his Reviewer and too little to the direct argument. Now, we intended no such intimation: we meant to give him the largest liberty consistent with keeping to the question at issue. Notwithstanding his intention to pass most we said, he has devoted five-twelfths of his present article to his Reviewer's response. We have no fault to find with him for having done so, tho' we are glad to have him go on with the direct argument. We shall now follow him in it. To his

"I." We reply—The Scriptures no "where recognize" the *theological* "distinction between the body and spirit" of man: nor the theological idea of "the two-fold nature of man." Man is *one*, not two, however many things might enter into his constitution. As *one*, or as a unit, the Scriptures treat him, speak to him, command him, threaten him, and promise him. Or in other words, they uniformly regard him as a *whole*, and not as two separate entities. They regard him as capable of dissolution, and when dissolved as dead; not one entity alive and another dead; and hence teach us the importance of a resurrection from the dead in order to being alive again; whereas the theological distinction, for which the Prof. contends, teaches that the essential man is a distinct entity called the soul, and lives in spite of death, and must live whether there be a resurrection or not. In fact, there is not, and cannot be a resurrection of the man, because the man, viz.: the soul entity, was never dead; and hence Christ is not the resurrection and the life to man, but only of the soul's cage, called the body. A mighty honor that!

"II." The Prof. says the Scriptures "uniformly represent death as a separation of the body and spirit of man." Yes, and they as uniformly represent death as a separation of the *breath* and body; and such a representation just as truly proves the breath an entity as the spirit of man. The question is not settled and cannot be settled by such argumentation: it is naught but pure assumption; and ten thousand such theological assumptions are lighter than vanity in an untrammelled mind. The question comes back, Is that spirit, separated from the body in death, a distinct entity, or being, called the soul? The Prof. affirms it is, and we deny it; and he, as yet, in our judgment, has utterly failed to sustain his affirmative. As to the "consciousness of soul or spirit," when the man is dead, the Prof. has not one solitary text in the Bible that affirms that doctrine. His argument on this point is all *inferential*: he infers it, as all others on his side of the question do, while disregarding the *positive* declarations of inspiration that "there is no knowledge in sheol"—the state of the dead; "the dead know not anything;" Eccl. 9: 5, 10: "there is no remembrance of God in death; in sheol" (the state of death) "who shall give thee

thanks?" a most expressive question, importing that it cannot be done. Psal. 6: 5. If any doubt remained as to the fact, the Psalmist removes it by saying, "The dead praise not the Lord," Psal. 115: 17; and Hezekiah declares that, "Sheol cannot praise God;" Isa. 38: 18. Those who are there—and all the dead are in sheol—cannot praise God; and Solomon has told us why they cannot do it, viz: because there is no knowledge there: Eccl. 9: 10. With inspired testimony of this positive character against the consciousness of the dead, what avails all the theological inferences to the contrary? Just nothing at all; yet we shall examine the Prof.'s texts from which he expects to prove "virtually," that David, Solomon, and Hezekiah were all wrong, and that "a soul" separated from the body at death has "a conscious existence between death and the general resurrection." This point he takes up under head "III;" and commences with the "thief," Luke 23: 42, 43.

It is not of the least weight in argument what the Jews believed in the time of the thief: and our Prof. would have shown himself more of a theologian if he had appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures instead of calling on Josephus for help. At the same period here spoken of the Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls; and the Prof. might as well have appealed to that fact to prove that Socrates was right in supposing some men's souls would go into bears, asses, ants, &c., after their separation from their bodies by death. We have shown the Hebrew Scriptures condemn the idea of consciousness or knowledge when men are dead. Unless Jesus taught the contrary by positive declarations we have no right to affirm a doctrine is true, because Josephus and the Jews believed it in his days. Jesus did teach, and teach distinctly, that the "resurrection, at the last day" is the hope for a future life. What he said to the thief, therefore, is to be understood in harmony with all his other declarations. He never promised his followers a reward till "the resurrection of the just;" Luke 14: 14; and that resurrection he told them would be "at the last day," John 6: 40: when the Son of Man shall come in his glory;" Matt. 16: 27. And "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon THE THRONE of his glory:" then will be the time of "his appearing and kingdom." The thief prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." "Into," says Bishop Whately, "is a mis-translation; it should be 'in thy kingdom': the meaning is—at thy second coming in triumphant glory."—Future States, p. 324. Jesus' answer is in harmony with the prayer—"Verily I say unto thee to-day," or *this day*—what day? the day they hung upon the cross? No: but the day the thief had just spoken of, viz: when Christ shall come in his kingdom; or, if it suits better—shall come *into* his kingdom. The answer is, in the day of Christ's coming into, or in his kingdom, the thief should be with him in paradise: in that delightful state.

The assumption that paradise is the *theological* heaven, is an unfounded speculation, without one text in the book of God to sustain it. Paul's

"third heaven" is the same as paradise; but we may yet show that the third heaven of Paul has not the relationship of a "third" cousin to the *theological* heaven of the Prof. The fact is, the thief did not die the same day that Jesus did: for the Jewish day ended at evening, or sun down. Jesus died about 3 o'clock, P. M., but when the evening was come, the thieves were still alive and had their legs broken to hasten their death; for death by crucifixion was a lingering one. Here then is a fact which shows Jesus did not speak of *the day in which* the thief prayed. But again. Three days after the promise of Christ to the thief, Jesus declares to Mary, John 20: 17, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." Yet the Prof. affirms, Jesus did go to heaven the very day he died! Which shall we believe; him who is "the way, the truth, and the life," or the Prof.? Jesus did not ascend to paradise—"to heaven"—for three days, certain: so if the thief went there prior to that time, he did not find Jesus, and the promise, as construed by the Prof., *failed!* Any attempt to evade the words of our Lord, John 20: 17, by saying, He meant he had not been to heaven in his body, or his body had not been there, is "puerile" indeed. Jesus speaks of *himself*—his *personality*—"I am not yet ascended," &c. Jesus—the *person*—had not been to paradise the third day after the crucifixion; thus "we have the explicit declaration of Christ" that the Prof.'s construction of the text under consideration is not correct; and that the *Pharisaic* notion of separated souls going to heaven is a falsehood. The "passage can have but one meaning," and that is adverse to our Prof. And it is further fatal to him, from the fact that Jesus saith not one word about his own spirit or soul, nor that of the thief. "Thou shalt be with me," not, your spirit shall meet my spirit, as the Prof. affirms. Hark! "Thou shalt be with me." Three days after, the same *me* saith, "I am not yet ascended." Here is a "strait betwixt two" for our Prof. If here is not demonstration of the utter incorrectness of the theological assumptions from this text then let the Prof. show it.

"2." The Prof.'s appeal to our Lord's discourse with the Sadducees, is powerless; and when interpreted in the light of the facts in the case, and the positive scripture testimony that the dead are without knowledge, it totally subverts his theory. What are the facts? "The Sadducees deny that there is any resurrection;" verse 27; and they used the term *death* in the sense of eternal cessation of being. To disprove the doctrine of a restoration to life by a resurrection, they present the case of a woman who had seven husbands, and then inquire—"In the resurrection whose wife of them is she?" v. 33. Jesus informs them that in "the resurrection from the dead" they "neither marry nor are given in marriage;" v. 35. He then proceeds to say—"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham," &c., v. 37; or, as Matthew records it, chap. 22: 31, "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham," &c.? "For he is not the God of the dead"—i. e., of those who have eternally

ceased from life or being; which was the state of all the dead according to the Sadducees—"but the God of the living"—those who are to live again by a resurrection; for, saith Jesus, It is "touching the resurrection of the dead" that God spake to Moses in the bush—therefore, the conclusion is inevitable, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must have a resurrection from the dead, for God is their God, which he could not be if there is no resurrection: hence Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "all live unto Him"—in His counsel and purpose, which makes their *future* life sure by a resurrection: "God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were," as he had previously said to Abraham, "I have made thee a father of many nations;" and this when as yet he had no child. See Rom. 4: 17.

According to the Prof.'s theology, God is not the God of the *bodies* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, because by his own admission, their bodies were *dead*; and "the Lord is not the God of the *dead*;" therefore, He is not the God of those patriarchs' bodies! Hence their bodies will never have a resurrection, if the Prof.'s theology be correct; and as he affirms their souls were not dead, a resurrection of them is impossible, because it is *the dead* that are to be raised. Thus Sadduceism is triumphant, instead of being silenced.

The Prof.'s theological theory, and that of his school, is, That our Lord proved the resurrection of the dead by proving that dead men are *now alive!* Would such an argument have silenced the Sadducees? Never; nor any other thinking man that thinks beyond a theological *creed*. How does the fact that the persons are alive prove a future resurrection of dead men? Let it not be forgotten the *resurrection* is the question at issue, and not the living existence of a soul entity. Jesus, we may depend, did not wander from the question: therefore he spoke of the *purpose* of God to raise the *dead* patriarchs, and demonstrated it by an appeal to the law and testimony; for if there is no resurrection of them, then have they *eternally* ceased from life: but their death is not such a cessation from life, for the Lord calls himself their God, which he would not do if he had not purposed they should live again by a resurrection from the dead. Let the Prof., and all others, remember, that there is not one word in that entire controversy with the Sadducees about a soul or spirit, the important *fixtures* in Prof. M.'s vocabulary! Strange, indeed, if Jesus intended to teach the soul-entity doctrine of the Prof., that he entirely omits to speak of it, at all, and lays all the stress on the resurrection of the dead. Look at it. The Prof. has to talk about Abraham's "soul and body;" but Jesus saith not a word of either, but talks of "the dead" and of their *resurrection*, and the proof of it from the fact that without it God is not their God; because without it they did not and could not live; but to God, and in His purpose, they do live, because their resurrection is certain as the unchangeable purposes of His counsel.

We sum up on this head thus: The Sadducees denied the resurrection from the dead—the great doctrine Jesus taught. Jesus proved the resurrection was certain, or Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob

could not be said to have Jehovah for their God, inasmuch as he is not the God of those dead in the Sadducee sense. This proof from Moses *silenced* them; not by teaching their "souls" were alive, but by demonstrating the resurrection from the dead, without which they could not be alive. But on the Prof.'s views, the Sadducees could not have been silenced, for they might have replied—"Master, how does the fact that these patriarchs are now alive prove the resurrection from the dead?" Surely, it could have been no proof at all; and the Prof. himself can make no more of it than "a strong *presumption* that sooner or later the *body* will live also?" No, Prof., it does not give even a presumption that way, but the reverse: and theologians of the Prof.'s school are fast losing sight of the importance of the resurrection; and his Br. Dr. Adam Clarke, could not tell why the doctrine of the resurrection is so little dwelt upon, and its importance so little felt, in these days, when it was so prominent and so much insisted on by the apostles. We can tell him. It is because an immortal soul is substituted for, and takes the place of the resurrection, in these days: and according to the Prof.'s theology a resurrection is a useless incumbrance to the once caged but now free soul. Has the uncaged soul of Abel been six thousand years basking in heaven, and must it now be sent after its cage that Cain broke to pieces? How useless! How revolting to that long happy soul! The resurrection of the body, on the common theory, has no importance, and is a positive evil; and hence many thinking men, who believe in the immortal soul-entity, are abandoning the resurrection altogether, or making it an emergence of their fancy-souls out of the body at death; and so death is the deliverer, and its praises are sung, while Jesus and the Bible resurrection are completely supplanted by this theological soul-entity.

"3." We admit that so far as *words* are concerned, Matt. 10: 28, looks most like sustaining the Prof. of anything he has urged; yet we "fear not." If a theory is to be established by a disregard for many positive texts, opposing the construction put upon this text,—and by an appeal to popular prejudice, then is the Prof. successful; and any Papist is equally successful when he quotes the "express declaration of Christ," "*This is my body*," to prove the eucharistical bread "is the *real body* of Christ."

Whatever the text means it does not mean that men cannot kill the soul in any sense: because the Scripture testimony, five times repeated in one chapter, viz., Joshua 10th, is, that men have killed and "*utterly destroyed souls*:" see verses 28, 30, 32, 35, 39. The Prof.'s construction, therefore, of Matt. 10: 28, cannot be the true one. Besides, whatever the soul is, that is here spoken of, it is something that God can and will *destroy* if the person is wicked. We may arrive at the true sense of the text by comparing it with our Lord's words, Matt. 16: 25, and parallel texts. The same original word is found in Matt. 10: 28, and 16: 25. The latter text reads thus—"Whosoever will save his *life* [*psuchen*—soul] shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his *life* [*psuchen*—soul] for my sake shall find it." The following verse has the

same original word, and is translated *soul*. On this 26th verse, Dr. Adam Clarke says—"On what authority many have translated the *psuchen*, in the 25th verse, *life*, and in this verse, *soul*, I know not: but am certain it means *life* in both places." Now, a man may be deprived of *present life* by man, but man cannot extinguish *life* so as to make it a *final destruction*, but God can. Men may kill us now, "but after that have no more that they can do;" Luke 12: 4; but God "can destroy both *life and body*:" utterly extinguish them.

Let it be remembered our Lord was, in each of the cases we have introduced, talking to his disciples *alone*, and fortifying them against temptations to apostacy under their persecutions. He tells them men can only deprive them of animal or bodily life, while God holds in his hands another and more important life, which they "shall find" if faithful unto death—a life of which men cannot deprive them, though God is able to remove them *utterly* from all life, and will do it if they sin by apostacy: therefore, "fear Him," and not men who have no such power. Such an interpretation is in harmony with all our Lord's teaching; and in harmony with the positive testimony of the Bible that the dead have "no knowledge," and that the resurrection of the dead is the only hope of man.

"4." As the Prof. seems to admit the case of the Rich Man and Lazarus is a parable, we are saved any labor on that score. But if it was intended to teach that there is a "superadded entity, called the soul," in the "creature man which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground," it is sadly defective in the Prof.'s important *fixtures*: for there is no mention of either soul or spirit in the entire parable, nor of *body* as distinguished from the men themselves. If these men had such souls as the Prof. contends for, it is passing strange that not one word is uttered about them; while the Prof. affirms "the *souls* of the parties are represented as living, talking," &c., therefore "*souls* live after death," and the text teaches "the conscious existence of *souls* after death;" and yet, we repeat it, not one word is said about soul or spirit in the whole account. Are your "creeds" as deficient in these *fixtures*, Prof.? We can find them often, in nearly all the creeds in Christendom.

If this portion of Scripture is a parable, as nearly all commentators are agreed, then it is not a history of individual persons, but an allegory to represent some events in the future. Bishop Lowth says—"Parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of *fictitious* or accommodated events, applied to the illustration of some important truth."

The truth to be illustrated by this parable is, that two classes of men were to be very differently affected by the charge in the dispensation from the law of Moses to that of the Gospel; and this key to it is given us at verse 16—"The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached," &c. Here is the change now taking place; the effect on two classes of men, viz: Jews and Gentiles, is the point to be illustrated by the parable. The peculiarities of the Jewish economy were to pass away

—their peculiar relation to God, which was their life-time, was to end, and a more spiritual dispensation was to be opened; the Gentiles were hereafter to enjoy privileges, and a relation to God and His covenant with Abraham, which had not before been possessed. The change in the condition of Jews and believing Gentiles is fitly represented by death. The Jews lost their peculiar privileges, and, rejecting Messiah, have been politically and ecclesiastically dead ever since, and in a state of torment such as no other people ever experienced for near 1800 years; while the believing Gentiles passing from that state in which they were "not a people" became interested in the Abrahamic covenant, and are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. See Gal. 3 : 9, 29.

In a parable we are to look only for the main scope and design of it; and not like some mere theorists and speculators attempt to find something to correspond with every minutiae that is introduced into it. This parable we regard in the light, then, of a simple and forcible representation of the different states of those under the law covenant, and those who were turned to the covenant of grace, or favor, made through Abraham in Jesus Christ, and fully opened at the advent of Jesus some 1800 years ago, and which is still in force, so that they who are Christ's are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise," and "are blessed with faithful Abraham," having promise of life eternal when Christ shall return "from heaven" to raise all his saints from the dead "at the last day."

"5." The case of Moses at the transfiguration is next presented as proof by our Prof. Now, as the Prof.'s school maintain spirits are immaterial, they cannot be seen by material eyes; therefore it was not Moses' spirit, nor his disembodied soul, that was present; for the disciples saw "two men, who appeared in glory;" Luke 9 : 30, 31; hence Moses had been raised from the dead for the occasion, or it was a sight in vision. Christ appeared in glory on this occasion; but that glory was not his permanent condition; for he afterwards died. Moses, if really there, was there "in glory;" so saith the text: therefore he had been raised from the dead for the occasion; though it was not his permanent state, any more than that of Jesus at that time. We reply then unhesitatingly and unwaveringly—Moses was there by a resurrection for the occasion, or he was only there by a representation in vision of that glory which is to be possessed by Christ's followers when he shall actually appear in glory—"When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory;" Col. 3 : 3. See also 2 Pet. 1 : 16-18.

Thus, Prof., we have presumed to *controvert* your "incontrovertable instance in which a human spirit has manifested itself as having a conscious existence while the body is in the grave." Moses was dead—Moses was buried; but Moses appeared in glory at the transfiguration—not Moses' spirit, as the Prof. affirms: no, it was Moses—the same Moses that died and was buried. His appearance is "incontrovertable" evidence of his resurrection from the dead, if he was *actually* there in person, even though he might fall asleep again to wait the revelation of his Master in his permanent glory.

"6." If *assumptions* could pass for proof the Prof. has carried all before him. He has assumed, without a shadow of evidence, that "the Book of Revelation repre-

sents the righteous dead as indescribably happy, singing and praising God in a world of light;" thus he represents the Spirit of God as inspiring the Psalmist falsely when he declared—"The DEAD praise not the Lord;" Ps. 115 : 17. His reference to Rev. 7th in proof that there is a superadded entity, called the soul—in man formed of the dust—is fatal to his theory. In the first place, the whole scene of revelation from chapter 4, onward, is a *visionary* representation of things future, and not of things then existing. Chap. 4 : 1, John saith, he heard a voice saying "I will show thee things which must be *hereafter*." Hence, the vision related to a period, or periods, in the future. The vision in the last part of chap. 7, is clearly a scene at the end of the present age or dispensation; for they are in the "temple" of God, v. 15; and "no man was able to enter into the temple till the seven plagues" which "fill up the wrath of God were fulfilled" or completed. See chap 15 : 1, 6-8. Till the wrath of God is completed "on earth"—chap. 16 : 1, 2—no man can enter the temple of God: but the innumerable company John saw, chap. 7, were in "His temple;"—therefore it was *after* the "last plagues," and consequently subsequent to the resurrection, and not while the saints were dead. Besides, there must have been some materiality about them, as "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." We do not wonder the Prof. quotes *poetry* instead of the Bible to prove that dead men are "singing and praising God."

The Prof. goes on to say—"In the 5th chapter we have another view of the happy residents of heaven." We do not wonder he passed them with this single remark; for had he dwelt upon it, he would have brought out the fact that the scene is laid at the same period with chap. 21 : 1-5, where there is "no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain." Such is the scene corresponding with chap. 5; for, saith John, "Every creature which is in heaven, and in the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Such a scene belongs no where this side of that of chap. 21; and is at a time when death and hell are both destroyed; and there is no sorrow, nor pain in the universe of God. We may further remark, on this scene, that it is fatal to the existence of the *theological* hell; as every possible location is embraced in it, and "every creature" is praising God and the Lamb; so the wicked at that time, have all been converted or destroyed; for there is no wailing heard, no jarring hell-song, which theologically consists in cursing God and the Lamb.

The Prof.'s appeal to Rev. 19th, to prove the conscious existence of dead men's immaterial spirits, is equally unavailing; for the scene is laid at "the marriage of the Lamb, and his wife has made herself ready." Wonder if that will take place, Prof., till the church is completed and clothed with bodies like Christ's glorious body? See Phil. 3 : 20, 21. Do immaterial spirits ride "white horses," Bro. M.? Please look at that chapter again with its connection, and see if you can lay the scene this side the resurrection of the saints.

The Prof. assumes that the expression, chap. 14, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth,"

proves the consciousness of dead men. He disregards the connection and the period. This testimony relates to a particular point of time in the prophetic chain. It is laid at a time when the seven last plagues were about to be poured out, and the general announcement of that fearful visitation had just been made. Either just before, in the time of, or immediately after those plagues, comes the time of glorifying the church of Christ, by their Lord's return "from heaven," and the resurrection of those who have "died in the Lord." From that period, they are to be blessed; not in a disembodied state, but by a resurrection from the dead, to behold their Lord's glory "and be made like him;" see 1 John 3: 3. If, however, the words "Blessed," &c., related to the death of the saints, who die at that period, they have a clear explanation in the fact that the time spoken of was to be one of fearful judgments on the earth, and those who die in the Lord are taken away, or hid from the evil, and "rest from their labors." Here is no proof of their consciousness while dead.

Instead of saying, as the Prof. does, that all the Apocalyptic views "are essentially wrong," if his theory is not true; we say, the Prof.'s views of the Apocalyptic scenes, we doubt not, "are essentially wrong," and subversive of Bible truth, his additional poetical demonstration to the contrary notwithstanding.

"7." To the Prof.'s assumptions and questions we answer—The *saints*, or *holy ones*—for so the word signifies—who accompany our Lord from heaven, when he comes to raise those who sleep in Jesus, are expressly declared to be the *angels*. "When he [Christ] cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels:" Mark 8: 38. "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels:" Matt. 16: 27. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the *holy angels* with him:" Matt. 25: 31. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty *angels*:" 2 Thess. 1: 7. Thus we have answered the Prof.'s questions with four texts; in which it is distinctly stated who the holy ones, or saints are, that accompany Christ on his return from heaven; and in not one of them, nor in any other text in the Bible, is there any mention of "the *spirits* of the sainted dead" coming with him on his return from heaven; but we are told that when the dead in Christ are raised then they "shall be *caught up* to MEET the Lord in the air;" 1 Thess. 4: 17. They are first BROUGHT from the dead; not from heaven: then the living in Christ are changed, and both classes "caught up together to meet the Lord;" and of course did not come with him. Thus we have again found the Prof.'s assumptions are neither "incontrovertable," nor the "Doctrine of Divine Revelation," but are fables of the Pagan-theological schools; and he has utterly failed, in our judgment, to produce anything like proof of the affirmative of the question at issue. He has not shown by a solitary text that such a spirit as he contends for was "breathed into" the creature man which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground; or that any distinct entity called the soul was superadded to that man. He has not shown by any text of Scripture that the theological distinction of soul and body, making man a double entity, is true. He has not shown that any such soul as he contends for was ever separated from the body at death. He has not shown that there is any conscious ex-

istence of a soul of a dead man; but he has *assumed* these points throughout. "The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground:" that is God's testimony. *That man*, by the inspiration of breath, "became a living soul," or creature: not, had another entity called the soul put into him. No such doctrine has a "thus saith the Lord" for it. "Life" did not "begin with the union of soul and body;" and "death is" not "a separation of two natures," but a dissolution of the man—"His *breath* goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that *very day* his thoughts perish:" Psa. 146: 4. No such doctrine is found in all the Bible as that *souls* depart to Paradise at death. Not one word in the Book of God is there that hints that *souls* "re-enter" bodies at the resurrection, as the Prof. affirms! No, the Prof.'s entire argument on this subject is made up of theological assumptions spun out of Pagan speculations, grafted on to Christianity between the second and fourth centuries, thereby corrupting the christian system and opening the flood-gates to the Papal apostacy, with its deified saints, worshipping them, and seeking help from them; bringing in the Papal purgatory, by which a wicked and designing priesthood could sponge the poor ignorant people out of money to get their friends prayed out of purgatory, with all the abominations connected therewith. The doctrine for which the Prof. contends is the very life blood of all the fooleries, corruptions, and blasphemies of Romanism, and "Spirit Rapping," now cursing the world and destroying its thousands and tens of thousands. It is the summing up, the perfection, the full development of the doctrine—"Ye shall not surely die." It maintains the *essential* man—the commanded man—the threatened man—the *sinning* man did not die, and cannot die. God saith, "the *soul* that sinneth it shall die;" "the wages of sin is death;" Ezk. 18: 4, 20; and Rom. 6: 23.

The Prof. says—"I shall devote no further space to the direct proofs of the single question whether or not man has a soul;" though he tells us he has "by no means exhausted the scripture argument." Let it be remembered the question is not whether "man has a soul"—that point we have never denied—but the question is—"Does the Bible teach that the *creature* man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground—has a *superadded* entity called the soul?"

Now if the Prof. has not "exhausted the scripture argument" in the affirmative of this question, we beg of him to do it, and not to falter as long as the Bible, in his estimation, has any ammunition left in its store. This is the "single question" we agreed to discuss with him; and we will not be moved from it till he shall confess he has "exhausted the scripture argument" on the "affirmative." The "philosophy or metaphysics" of the subject we will not discuss. If the Scriptures cannot settle it there is no such thing as its being settled. And as the Prof. says, "If the arguments adduced do not prove it, nothing could," we conclude he declines bringing his Bible batteries to an "exhausted" state on the question.

In what way he is to pay his "respects more directly to his Reviewer of the Examiner," we shall see when his "next" appears. Till then the Prof. will allow us to pay our respects to him, by saying—Notwithstanding we may have been sometimes severe in our responses, it is not from

any want of respect for himself personally. His conduct towards ourself, in our personal interviews, has been such as to endear him to us. He has not, like nearly all our opposers, refused to come near us, but has often called to see us, and conducted in a friendly manner; and we shall still be happy to see him at any time, tho' we differ. We have no doubt he is in error on the question we have been discussing; but we were once in the same error, and we know how to make great allowances for those differing with us, especially if they reciprocate. Our readers, therefore, may be assured we feel kindly towards brother Mattison, notwithstanding the strong battling that has gone on between us. Toward him, personally, we have none but the most sincere good will. May the Lord guide him and ourself into all truth, and save us from all error, and bring us each to Life Eternal, through Jesus Christ.

REV. N. D. GEORGE AND MATERIALISM.—The Methodist Tract Society has published a Tract made up mainly from articles from *Zion's Herald*, which were written by Mr. George. As the matter appeared in that paper it was headed, "Materialism Anti-Scriptural; or, the Doctrines of George Storrs Examined and Refuted." The publishers of the Tract have done well to drop from the head, the word "*Examined*," for no man who has read our views, and regards truth, can say that this work is an *examination* of the "Doctrines" we hold; he has studiously avoided the whole foundation of our position; has scarcely taken a look at our superstructure; yet our name is blazoned at the head of the Tract which is almost exclusively an attack upon Eld. Z. Campbell. Bro. Campbell has written a reply which may serve as a suitable rebuke to Mr. George, and all others who, by misrepresentation and ridicule, think to pour contempt upon the views of those who differ from them. Bro. Campbell's reply, will make a 12mo. pamphlet of 36 pages. Price \$3 per 100. It is headed—"**MATERIALISM SCRIPTURAL; or, The Doctrine of Rev. N. D. George Exploded.**"

Thousands ought to be scattered, as the Methodists are giving their Tract a wide circulation. Will you send your orders immediately, that we may know how many to print? Address, "GEORGE STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office*, New York."

THE EXAMINER for this month appears later than we intended. We were obliged to wait several days for paper after our form was ready for the press.

We have again found it necessary to occupy more space in our columns than we intended. We trust our readers will bear with us. The issue for November we intend shall be early.

The Voice of Philadelphia.

To the Friends of Bro. Storrs and the Bible Examiner:

The friends in Philadelphia, wish to say through the columns of the EXAMINER, that they would like to see the sum of One Thousand Dollars raised for Br. STORRS, over and above all expenses of the EXAMINER: and we pledge ourselves for the sum of Two Hundred Dollars, or one-fifth of the amount. And, to let the friends abroad know that we are in earnest in what we say, we have the amount subscribed, and One Hundred and Twenty Dollars paid

over to Br. STORRS. We hope the friends in different sections will take this matter in hand and place Br. STORRS in that position that he can give his time to his paper and preaching, and take no thought for the morrow, in relation to what he shall eat, and how he shall live. This subscription of ours is to be annually, and we hope others will do likewise. Yours truly,

The Brethren and Sisters of

Sept. 18th, 1854.

PHILADELPHIA.

THE EDITOR OF BIBLE EXAMINER acknowledges with gratitude to the *Donors*, and thanks to the God of all consolation, the following recent donations for his *personal* use and benefit. It has proved a mighty relief in trying circumstances. May the Lord reward all the contributors.

From the friends in Philadelphia, \$120; from Paterson, N. J., \$100; from a friend in Wisconsin, \$8; Jane Morris, \$1; Geo. Hill, \$1; J. G. Baldwin, \$1.

HELP FOR EXAMINER FOR THIS YEAR.—C. Sears, \$3; J. T. Parker, \$3; Joseph Eaton, \$1; A. Pell, \$1; Wm. B. Wade, \$1.

THE EDITOR will be at Paterson, N. J. the *first* and *third* Sabbaths of October, and at Philadelphia the *second*.

NOTICES of several works, and some other matters are of necessity laid over.

"DEATH NOT LIFE."—Br. Blain has issued a new edition of this work; to which he has added, in 32 pages, "*A Review of Dr. E. Beecher's Conflict of Ages.*" Good, we presume, but we have not space to remark upon it now. Price 25 cts. Address, "ELD. J. BLAIN, Buffalo, N. Y."

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Shall it be published *semi-monthly* in 1855? That will depend, under God, on its Patrons. We are willing to labor in its issue, and do the best we can to make it useful on the *Life Theme*, and other topics so far as time and space will allow. Yet we cannot do it without the *co-operation* of friends abroad. We have before stated that \$900 is the least sum for which it can be published, without counting the Editor's services anything: and this is probably less by \$100 than the actual cost. We are willing to hazard our own support, without any pledges for us, provided the \$900 are paid by the 25th of December next. This can be done if the present subscribers each send us *one dollar* for next year. But as all are not expected to do this, let those who wish the *semi-monthly* issue not only pay their own subscription but get at least *one* new subscriber. In this way, we doubt not, the amount named will all be paid by the time specified. After that, every dollar for the EXAMINER will be so much towards a compensation to the EDITOR. Shall we hear from all our friends without delay? Any person in the States collecting and sending us *five* dollars shall have *six* copies sent to his order, for 1855. The same in Canada for \$6. Remember, our terms are "*Payment always in advance.*" We cannot depart from this rule.